THE HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION.

The Secret History of its Causes, Objects, and Disasters.

Interesting Letters of Count Tekeli, and Ministers Sezmere and Vukovics.

Letter from Count Teleki to Lord Dudley Stuart.

ZURICH, Jan 1, 1852.

My Lord:—With the greatest astonishment have I read, in the Times of the 1st and 2d of December, just brought before my eyes, two letters concerning the affairs of Hungary—the one signed Prince Esterbary, and the other barely Count Batthyanyi, without a pranomen, though there are several of this name.

These two Hungarian peers raise their voice to These two Hungarian peers raise their voice to attack their county's cause-to arraign the ministry of 1848, to which Esterhazy himself belonged—and to calumniate one of our most illustrious martyrs, the immortal Count Louis Batthyanyi, late prime minister of Hungary. I, therefore, as a Hungarian, as a faithful ally of the last named say porter of our sacred cause, and as one of his most intimate and devoted friends, interfere in this discussion. I owe it to ray country, to the government under which I served, and to the spirit of our herois martyr, whose honer is so unworthily attacked. That I am so late in my reply, is because I have but just known of these letters. You know that I live quite out of the world.

Prince Esterhazy avows what are his motives for

Anow that I live quite out of the world.

Prince Esterhazy avows what are his motives for writing. Hear his own words:—"I am principally faduced to address you these lines by the report of what takes place in England relative to Hungary, and the strange confusion of ideas which seems to prevail there at this moment, in several quarters, mixing up actions of an essentially revolutionary character with constitutional and patriotic pri-ciples." It is evident, then, that the Prince ha taken up the pen expressly in order to counteract the sympathies which the cause of his country in spires in the great and generous English nation. But with his notives I shall not concern myself; nor shall I discuss how he can have the face, openly and unblushingly, to avow the end at which he drives. I mean to analyse the arguments and accusations -- to overthrow the erroneous assertions sations—to overthrow the erroneous assertions—to mark out the utter ignorance of the whole recent history of Hungary which both these letters alike betray. Prince Esterhany affirms that, since 1825, the Austrian government has firmly respected all the fundamental principles of our constitution. I am thankful to him for fixing this date as the commence ment of such respect, it relieves me from I am thankful to him for fixing this date as the commencement of such respect. It relieves me from going back to treat of the epochs prior to 1825. Otherwise, I might have had to dilate on all that the Hungarian nation suffered in three centuries—from 1527 to 1825—under the hypocritical and bloody tyranny of Hapsburg. I might have needed to prove that of this dynasty all the sovereigns were perjured except two, namely:—Leopold II., who reigned only eighteen months, and Joseph II., who reigned daking each to our laws by refusing to be evaded taking each to our laws by refusing to be evaded taking oath to our laws by refusing to be erowned. All the rest violated our constitution after swearing fidelity to it; and of this the Prince Esterhazy seems to be fully aware. From 1811 to 1825 the Emperor King Francis summoned as Diet, although the constitution commands that a biet shall be held every third year at least. In 1823, the same King, against the constitution and his royal oath, tried to raise troops and taxes by his mere edict. This ended with 1825. But after this let us see how Francis and his successor, Ferdinand V., have respected our institutions. It will suffice that I name a few important facts. It is expressly held down by our constitution with a Hunger by laid down by our constitution, "that Hungary is free and independent kingdom in regard to the form of its government; that it shall never be suit ordinated to any other country or nation, but shall always preserve its peculiar constitution, and shall, in consequence, be governed and administered by its kings, not after the model of other countries, but by its own proper laws and customs. That the

its kings, not after the model of other countries, but by its own proper laws and customs. That the legislative power, composed of the sovereign and of the Diet, as representing the nation, has the sole right of making, interpreting, or repealing laws; and that legislation can in no other way in any case be exercised. That Hungary shall never be governed by edicts. That it shall not be governed according to the system established in the other states belonging to the house of Austria. That no public affairs shall be decided except by means of the Diet. That none but natives shall take part in the government of the country, or be named officer or commander in the Hungarian army. That the King shall never cause a foreign army to cross the frentier, and shall never declare war or conclude any treaty without the approval of the Diet."

All this has been guaranteed to us by our laws, by the coronation oaths, and, over and above, by the charters (diplomas) of our kings—which last is a personal covenant entered into with the country by every one of our sovereigns, without which they have never been able to obtain the crown. Yet, from 1825 to 1848, in spire of all these guarantees, in spite of the House of Austria's pretended respect for our constitution, foreigners have continually been mingled in our affairs. In fact, during all this period we were governed by Prince Metternich, an Austrian, and by Count. Kollowrath, a Bohemian. The proper Hungarian ministry, by a mere edict, was officially subordinated to a council of State, a mejerty of which were utter foreigners to Hungary. Our finances were administered by the Aulie Chamber of Vienna, composed almost entired of Germans and Bohemians; nor would the governof Germans and Bohamians; nor would the govern ment ever consent to give any account to the Diet of its disposal of the public funds. A line of custom houses separated Hungary from the other States of the House of Austria, and the tariff of dues and the the House of Austria, and the tariff of dues and the indirect taxes were settled by edict, in spite of the remonstrances of the Diet. Observe, moreover, especially, that they were fixed with a hostile purpose, so as to cripple the commerce and industry of Hungary, and work it to the exclusive profit of Austrian finance, Austrian commerce and industry; improverishing our ccuntry, impeding its communication with the civilized world, and rendering foreign commerce impossible to us.

As to the Hungarian army, three quarters of the As to the Hungarian army, three quarters of the officers were German or Buhemian, who did not know a word of our language. Moreover, without the Diet being consulted, German, Bohemian, and Italian troops were continually stationed in Hungary. The war department was kept in the hands of an Aulie council of war, sitting in Vienna, and composed entirely of persons foreign to Hungary; nor was the Hungarian Diet ever able to get cognizance of the proceedings of this department, which were managed in an absolutist manner, without any reference to the will of the country. Treaties were concluded, alliances were contracted, military expeditions were ordered, without giving any information to the Diet.

Our laws recognise to censorship of the press.

Our laws recognise to censorship of the press Our laws recognise no censorship of the press; yet a censorship was established without the concurrence of the Diet, and enforced without its consent, simply as an exigence of the Austrian system. The censorship was supid in severity, if ever any was, and sushed its rigor to the abaurd. The censor not only prescribed words of political meaning, but corrected an suther's style, and improved it into his own. For instance, one of these gentlemen, from a piece of postry, erased the words "Long live the Bishop!" because the author was a Protestant; and Hungarian Protestants have no bishops; and the unbappy poet in vain represented that a Catholic bishop was intended. On another occasion the censor biotted out "herois warrior," and wrote "brave soldier" instead. I limit myself occasion the censor blotted out "herois warrior," and wrote "brave soldier" instead. I limit myself to these two examples, though I could quote a thousand in support of my statement

The government was pleased to assume a censor ship even ever what was not intended for the press.

It forbade Kossuth to send to his acquaintances

manuscript summaries of the debates in the Diet and in the county congregations. Such a correspondence constituted an offence in the eyes of Austria, and for this Kosenth was brought to trial, and condemned to four years' imprisonment. His judges had been nominated by the Austrian government, and were in consequence dependent on it. This was in 1836. Such is the respect which, since 1825, the Austrian government has professed for

our institutions. If Prince Esterhazy finds there facts insufficient, I shall be always ready to quote additional ones, which will clearly test his at least incon-niderate assertion as to the good faith of the Aus-trian government. I could mention a good many cases of arbitrary imprisonment, blows mad against freedom of speech, condemnation for con stitutional language uttered in legal assembly, vio

stitutional language uttered in legal assembly, violations of our municipal rights, arbitrary exclusions
from the Diet of members legally elected, &c., &c.,
space and time here fail me; but in a fature letter
it will be easy to supply emissions.

The Count Batthyany of the Times (who has
singularly chosen to leave us ignerant of his personal name, Gustave), even outbids his friend
Prince issterhazy. He pretends not only that the
Austrian government, since 1825, has respected
our institutions, but (to quote his own words)
"since many years, every reassnable and practical
reform emanated from the crown, or obtained, if
preposed by others, like Count Szechény, its willing
support." It is surprising that a man can be so igborant of the affairs of his ewn country as to risk a
statement so contrary to trath. History offers no example of a government so hostile to every sort of reform and improvement as that of Austria was, even after 1825. Every thing that concerned im provement or public prosperity, even the most foreign to politics, raised a tempest in the govern-ment, and was made impossible by its resistance ment, and was made impossible by he resistant Did the landed proprietors desire to make conce siens to their farmers and peasants in order to reader the position of the great mass of the people mere cemformable to the principles of equity? They dashed against this unequitable and hateful opposi-tion. Witness the acts of the Diet from 1832 to

1836. It was impossible to reform the civil code, to suppress the delays of procedures, to give creditors guarantees as towards their debtors, or to introduce a commercial code into the country, without dashing against the ever impending government, which displayed a rare skill in transferring every question into the domain of politics; so that even a few weak reforms could only be passed by yielding up some of the guarantees of cur independence. For example. Every Hungarian, except in certain cases, had the right of being judged, whether in civil or criminal matters, by judges of his own choosing; that is to say, by judges who had been elected in each country by a majority of voices. Well, when an effort was being made (in 1840) to introduce a prompt and peremptory procedure in regard to bills of exchange and other similar bonds, it proved impossible to get the a sent of the government, except on the condition that all the tribunals instituted in this majter should be in its exclusive nomination.

nomination.

We were forced to despair of reorganizing the administration of our towns, and remedying the abuses which had been introduced, for it was impossible to evercome the obstacles interposed by the government. (Act of the Diat of 1844)

Did we aim to establish a national fund by taxes

distributed over all the inhabitants of the country, in order to construct canals, highways, and ratiways! The excrbitant demands of the government ways! The excritiant demands of the government always made them miscarry; since a fier having invaded for its own profit all our existing publicfunds, it would never consent to the new taxes in question, unless their proceeds were confided to its administration, without any real responsibility. (Diet of 1843-44) The more general was the interest and the greater the urgency of a measure projected for the country, the more insurmountable became the opposition of the obstinately conceited Austrian government. A considerable portion of the nobility (i. vernment. A considerable portion of the nobility (i.e., peerage,) itself having demanded the abolition of the absurd privilege of being exempted from taking the absurd privilege of being exempted from taking share in the public expenses, the government did not confine itself to seel aring itself openly hostile to this reform, but besides, ordered its agents to disperse themselves in the country districts, and stir up the perty nobility, (freeholders) and excite them to practical outrages against the partisans of the reform. Under the leading of these agents of the Austrian government unheard of acts of violence were in many places committed, and the deliberating assemblies of the countles became real fields of battle, where the question of reform was treated by blows of sabre and club. Count Louis Batthyanyi one day almost fell a victim himself to these shameful plots of the Austrian government. Threatened one day almost fell a victim himself to these shameful plots of the Austrian government. Threatened with death as chief of the party hostile to privileges, in one of the general assemblies of the county of Eisenburg, he owed his life to the courage and devotion of some friends. This was in 1843. At the diet of 1843-44, in spite of the government and its unworthy devices, a great majority of voices, and especially of the nobility (peers), demanded that all the nobility should take part in the public expenses; but it needed all the accordancy given by the events of March, 1848, to the national party, to triumph as to this point over the resistance of the government of Vienna. So much for the assertion of Count

as to this point over the resistance of the government of Vienna. So much for the assertion of Gount Gustave Batthyany, as to the reforms emanating from er supported by the Austrian government.

The preceding will perhaps suffice to disprove at the same time the other assertion of the prince and count, as to the dangerous revolutionary tendencies of the party of Louis Batthyany and Kossath, notwithstanding the excellent intentions and irreprochable conduct of the Austrian government.

The real questions are: Was it excusable in

The real questions are: Was it excusable in them to contend against such a government! Was it allowable to insist that the Hungarian charter it allowable to insist that the Hungarian charter should at length become a reality, after having been so often sworn to by the House of Hapsburg Lerraine? Did a man become anarchial by demanding equality in the matter of taxes, and in courts of law? In wishing te reform the civil code? to reorganize the administration of towns, to abolish tallages and feudal service? In short, in wishing to yield to the most imperious demands, to the most urgent needs of our century? I think these questions are already decided. Yes, certainly. The party, at the head of which we saw Count Louis Hatthyanyi, was the national party, was the party of reasonable reform, of liberty, et civilization, of justice, and of morality. The great citizen who justice, and of morality. The great citizen who contended all his life for such a cause, and to serve it has paid with his blood, ought at least to be screened from the calumny of his countrymen.

As to Count Stephen Szecheny, no one can have more admiration for him than I. It is possible there may have been some divergences of opinion between him and us as to the best means of combetween him and us as to the best means of com-bating the retrograde Austrian principle; but I know that he also struggled for the same cause as Louis Batthyanyi and Kossuth, and all of us why continued to belong to our own country. On the other hand, I cannot divine by what right Prince Esterbary and Count Gustave Batthyanyi ne w call forth the shade of Szecheny, so justly revered, when they, during his long and brilliant career, never supported him, either at the Hungarian Diet, or in any other way.

any other way.

It remains to me to analyze the assertions of Prince Esterhary, and of his echo. Count trustave Eatthyanyi, asto the events of PSIS. It is evident to all who know the affairs and history of Husgary, to all who know the share and history of Hungary, that the pretended concessions of 1848 were nothing but the development of all our preceding laws. The laws sanctioned by the Emperor King Fordinand V. in April of that year, made good to Hungary its parliamentary government—an independent ministry, proceeding out of and responsible to the Diet. This did but create a traty national covernment, and thus consecrate the ancient late. government, and thus consecrate the ancient inde

government, and thus consecrate the ancient is a penderce of the country; that is to say, it estab-lished in fact what has always existed in right. (Witness Art 3 of the Diet of 1818) All these "concessions" were, in fact, contained in the Treaty of Concellation (Pragmatic Sanction of 1723). They were, moreover, the aim and in the Treaty of Conciliation (Pragmatic Sanction of 1723). They were, mercover, the sim and necessary result of twenty-three years' continual struggle (from 1825 to 1848), just as the other laws of the same year, which proclaimed for ever civil and political equality, without distinction of tongue or creed, participation of all citizens in the public charges by a fair proportionality, and the total abolition of fendal service and all seignorial sights.

To secure that the constitution of the country thould be a reality—to develope it suitably to the exigencies of the times—has been the publicly avowed and loyally pursued end of that party which Prince Esterhary and his sole Hungarian su operter entitle subversive and demagogic, but which is, i

entitle subversive and demagogic, but which is, in fact, nothing but the national party; that is to say, the party of the whole nation, except only some dispatriated individuals.

It is very astonishing to see, that while accusing the two chiefe of this party of having professes pernicious principles—while affirming that their previous conduct was such as "gave rise to mistrast and repugnance." Prince Esterhary aspears to have been satisfied with the result and aim of their efforts in 1848; for he accepted a place in the Hungarian ministry formed at this epoch, and he avows himself that the formation of such a ministry was, at that time, useful to the interests of the monarchy. It is still more astonishing that, after having apat that time, useful to the interests of the monarchy. It is still more astonishing that, after having approved the concessions made to the country in 1818, namely, the laws sanctioned in April of that year, and after having made part in the ministry of that epoch, he yet treats as seditious plots and acts of high treason, the measures taken by this ministry and the diet with the sole end of preserving these corcessions, and of maintaining, in full vigor, what had been legally guaranteed to us by the Emperor-King himself.

ling himself.
The prince pretends that we abused these con The prince pretends that we abused these concessions, "for the annihilation of the royal power, and of the union between Hungary and Austria; but such an accusation would need to be more precisely defined. In what, then, according to him, did our ministry or diet go beyond their proper functions? In what did they fail of good faith?

As to the court of Vienna, it is easy to characterize, in few words, the policy which it followed in 1848. Immediately after having acceded to the aspirations of the country, as to the formation of a respensible ministry for Hungary and its appanages, it named, without the advice of this ministry, a has or governor of Croatia, and gave him a position in

it hamen, without the advice of this ministry, a ban or governor of Croatia, and gave him a position in dependent of the Hungarian government, although Croatia is one of the appanages of our country. It proceeded to use the ban to bring about a rupture between treatia and Hungary. It excited the Serbian and Wallack (Rousane) populations of Hungary to revolt against the laws of the country, and its legal government. Wherever it was able, it sent our most to reach village configurations. its legal government. Wherever it was able, it sent out men to preach pilage, conflagration, and murser. It secratly furnished the seditions with arms and munitions of war of every kind. After having officially ordered the sending of troops to put down the revolters and brigands, it gave secret orders to the commanders of those troops to conduct the war faintly, and rather to sacrifice their own soldiers, than carry off real advantages from the enemy. A gain, after having, by a royal edict, dated June 10, suspended the Ban of Creatia from all his civil and military functions, as arraigned of rebellion against the Hungarian government, it secretly ordered him not to submit, but to persever in his revolt; and then, in September, it invited him to invasie Hungary. All this singly with the object of overthrowing the Hungarian constitution.

Atrocities, the recital of which would make the bairstand on end, have been committed by savage bordes, asting at the instigation and under the auocces of Austria. A population of more than thirty incusand souls have perished in consequence of cose odious plots, without sounting those who have perished the battles. What name ought we to give puch a policy, in order to designate it as it decreas? And of what can the Hungarian government by accepted the secret of having defended the serves? And of what can the Hungarian govern-ment be accused, except of having defended the country when it was attacked? Prince Esterhary is shocked that the Hungarian

Country when it was attacked?

Prince Esterhazy is shocked that the Hungarian Diet ordered a lavy of troops, and an issue of paper money, without the sanction of the king. But where was the king? and what was he, at that moment? He was at Vienns, and had alroady erdered the invasion of Hungary; he was become an enemy of the country; and it is evident that we could not leave to him the care of providing for our defence.

We were tolerably well forced, I apprehend, to undertake our own affairs. It is truly impossible to reply seriously to so unserious an accusation.

Of the same character is the complaint in the same letter, that we turned away the soldiers from their duly, in recalling them to the succor of their country. I pass to an assertion, which particularly concerns Count Louis Batthyanyi. Prince Esterhasy complains of the "signal want of good faith on the part of the extreme fraction of the Hangarian ministry at Pesth, in publishing a decument, the manifesto of the Emperor against the Ban of Croatia, which, according to an agreement solemnly entered into by their president at Innspruck, in open conference, ought not to have been published but on a certain eventuality; which not having taken place, could give no right whatever to broak so solemn an engagement." I will not limit myself to the reply, that it is unworthy of Prince Esterhasy thus to speak ill of a man who can no longer reply to his insults; and, that the loyalty displayed in every trial by Count Louis Batthyany; that "knight without fear and without reproach," his well known firmness in fulfilling all his engagements, firmness for which he has paid with his life, make every such accusation absurd. Certainly, the memory of the great mattyr, who will live eternally in our hearts, has no need of my weak voice to be avenged of such a calumny. A man who has lived as he lived, is strong enough to claim the right of resting before the pencil of history, in face of immortality, and viewing in the distance the impartial verdict of posterity, which does not console, but gives repose, in promising a sure screen from calumny.

It is rather for myaelf than for him that I speak, for I should feel my own honor sullied if I kept silence in face of such an accusation, directed against one who was not only one of the greatest men in my country, but also my best friend. This is why I wish, in a few words, to bring before the bar so absurd an accusation, and markedly direct yeu

surd an accusation, and markedly direct yeu to it. The manifesto of which Prince Esterhazy speaks, and which, according to him, ought not to have been published, is that which suspends the Ban of Croatia from all his civil and military functions, as arraigned of levelt sgainst the laws of the country and the Hungarian Ministry. It would certainly have been conformable to the interests of the Austrian back stars cabinet (Camarilla) that such a decument, which undeniably testifies a duplicity almost unexampled in history, should never have been published. But how is the public now to be deceived as to this? How is the public now to be deceived as to this? How is the be made believe that this manifesto was designed to be kept secret? What? the emperor king had yielded, it seems, to the remonstrances of the Hungarian Ministry, and had been able to say "Yes? you are in the right. Yes? this Jellachich is a rebel, who deserves chastisement. Yes, I suspend him from all his civil and military functions. But, for the love of God, let the thing remain between ourselves. Let not the public, nor yet the traitor himself; have any knowledge that I have abandened him." I do not ask whether the President of the Hungarian Ministry could possibly have accepted such a proposal, but solely whether it could possibly have been made to him.

It was more possible to say, "Let us wait a few days longer before publishing this document. Perhaps the rebel will come to his senses." But that is exactly the alternative which did not come about. Jellachich persisted in revolt; not only cominued to arm, but in course invaded Hungary, and pone-

days longer before publishing this document. Perhaps the rebel will come to his senses." But that is exactly the alternative which did not come about. Jellachich persisted in revolt; not only continued to arm, but in course invaded Hungary, and ponetrated into the heart of the kingdem, to overthrow by bayonets both our constitution and our government. Did our premier promise to wait till this eventuality had occurred, and mean while deal so tenderly with the Ban Jellachich as not to publish the manifesto which abandoned him! Yet this is what results from Prince Esterhary's accusation. Heavens! how incomprehensible does a man become when he tries to uphold a bad oase.

After all, adopt for a mement the absurdity that our premier falsified his word given to the King. Why then, after committing this offence in the month of June, 1818, did the King continue him in the ministry! Why continue to testify esteem for his character and confidence in his loyalty and good intentions? That he did so, is certain from many autograph letters, which I have under my eyes, two of which are dated Sept 26 and 27 of 1848. Again, when Louis Batthyanyl had resigned in September, why was he again entrusted by the court of Vienna with the formation of a new ministry! Moreover, why did Prince Esterhary remain in the ministry even after the "signal want of good faith" of which he accuses his chief! Above all, how did he keep his intimate footing with the court until October, 1848, when he now is not asbamed to outrage his ashes!

Finally, I ask, if the accusation is not utterly groundless, why was it never among the heads of impeachment against Louis Batthyanyl in the courts martial—complaisant and servile instruments as they are for assassinating the reputation of public men at the will of the court of Vienna ! Why have they left to Prince Esterhary the honor of originating the charge! All the world knows what to think of the capital arrest of Count Louis Batthyani All the world know that it was a consequence of his old-fashioned respect

when you revere as a citizen of high and masculire virtue, nevertheless was guilty of dupticity to his king, falsified his solemn word, and cannot deny it." How then could that which is the head and front of Prince Esterbary's impeachment of him, escape the clearaightedness of the courts martial? As to the murder of Count Lamberg, it is known to be an isolated evine. As to the pretended no As to the murder of Count Lamberg, it is known to be an isolated orime. As to the pretended protection extended to the assassins by the Hungarian diet and government, the truth is, than an inquest was instantly ordered, and that the government without delay took all necessary measures for the discovery and arrest of the culprits. Moreover, Louis Fatthyanyi at this very time ceased to be minister. Hence the accusation made by these two

peers is as calumnious as all their other imputa-What is an isolated deed, in comparison-O, heavens!—with the innumerable assassinations committed under the auspices, by the order, and at the instigation, of the Austrian government! If one counts the old men, women, and children butchered by the savege hordes who, in the name of Austrian government with

butchered by the savage hordes who, in the name of the house of Austria, covered the country with fire and blood, and acted under the leading of Austrian agents and Austrian officers, the murders will meunt to the figure of 30,000 at least.

But, no. Never, I believe, will the friends of Austrian absolutism dertroy the sympathies of your great and glorious nation for the cause of my country. There is too much analogy, not only as to institutions, but as to their history, between us and you. The policy of the house of Austria, in exciting the Croats to rebellion, and urging the Wallacks and Serbs to insurrection against the majority of the inhabitants and against its legal government, appears to me quite the same as the policy followed in 1687 and 1688 by James 11—a policy resting on Tyrconnell, Edmund Petre, Sundorland, leffreys, &c. And the situation of Hungary, crushed by aid of Russian bayonets, seems like what might have been Englands case if James If. had succeeded, by aid of Louis XIV's samies and Ireland, in subjugating your ancestors, and establishing the despoism of a small misority to the hurt of the desired and metres of the ishing the despoism of a small misority to the part of the descest and most sacred interests of the The above will, perhaps, suffice to throw a just

light on the accusations made by the Prince and Count. Their letters contain likewise assertion which I have n t had time to analyze, but which are as groundless as those which I have overthrown Moreover, they refer to persons, and not to public measures, and do not touch the dead. This calmi my confedence. Those of us who have survived our disasters, and are at liberty, will have no need if my feeb's word to rebut calumny, but are strong

of my feeble word to rebut calumny, but are strong enough of themselves
I have still a few words to say to you about Prince Esterhary, and on his character as a Hungarian statesman. Before 1848, he was totally unsanous in liungary, or rather his name only was known as one of the richest landed proprietors, but neither his person nor his qualities. Having passed all his life abroad except a few months employed. neither his person nor his qualities. Having passed all his tife abroad, except a few months employed in visiting his castles, he speaks the language of his country very imperfectly, and has very little acquaintance with our laws. He was, therefore, incompetent to take part in our parliamentary struggle. For myself, since 1839, I have constantly taken part in them, and I think I have seen him at two of the sittings of our House of Peers; and I hnow that, in these two sittings, he naver opened his lips. Persons of whem he asked information, have assured me that his questions were quite amusing, for the ignerance which they betrayed of our affairs and parliamentary relations. He says, are fishered and musing for the ignerance which they betrayed or ar affairs and parliamentary relations. He cays, a his letter, that before 1848 he knew little of couls Batthyanyi, and nothing of Rossuth. Good; sat I knew, for I saw when I was one of the deput attensent to Vienna, in March, 1843, that at the lime the Prince paid court to Batthyanyi and Kossuth with a rare assidulty, and went to see these four or five times a day. We had, also, with suth with a rare assiduity, and went to see them four or five times a day. We had, also, with us some hundreds of young people, who followed us to Vienna, as clerks, as secretaries, or for patriotism, or for curiosity; and I know that the Prince sought their good graces with an eagerness truly singular. Nobody at that epoch oftener struck himself on the breast while be cried that he was a most realous, constitutional, and liberal patriot; that he was a deadly enemy of the camarilla and of buraaucracy, the very humble, faithful, and obedient servant of the whole entire nation. I know not whether he accepted with or without repugnance the ministry which was offered him; what I do know is, that upon becoming minister a few days later, his countenance was radiant enough. But these festive

days passed very quickly. Thanks to the hateful plots woven by the Austrian reactionaries, the career of our ministry was soon beset with ruggedness; and, at this second epoch, we saw Prince Esterhamy gradually withdrawing, and cooling in his pretestations for the sacred cause of fatherland; until, one fine moraing in September, when Austrian treason was in open day, Austro-Croat troops had been ordered to invade Hungary, the Prince decided to abandon, first his post and next his side. He went over to the enemy, and left his country to struggle with her thousand daugers. He began to court the camarilla, as he had courted Batthyanyi and Kossuth, and pushed his loyalty so far as to make his son, Prince Nicolas Esterhazy, Sub-Licutenant in the Austro-Russian army, which was attacking his country—an honor which the young Prince shared with an extremely small number of Hungarians of like temperaments, four or five at mest. I am happy to be able to assure you of it.

Two words for Count Gustave Batthyanyi. I knew his brother well, who, in 1849, was our Foreign Minister. For him I have a high esteem, and flatfer myself I am one of his intimate \*friends. I do not know that I have seen Count Gustave more than twice; but I know that he does not speak our language at all; 'that he does not know our codes, and that for more than twenty years (in fact, since 1825) he has lived abread, and has not busied himself with our affaire. In Hungary he is unknow—in certain coteries of London he seems to be more at home than in his own country.

Judge, then, my lord, whether the authors of the

in certain coteries of London he seems to be more at home than in his own country.

Judge, then, my lord, whether the authors of the two letters are competent to calighten the public concerning the cause of my country. I pray you, for the interest you have always shown in our cause, to do your best to give publicity to my letter.

Kindly receive the assurance of my high consideration, and of the sincere devotion with which I am, my lord, yours, &c.,

(Signed) Count Ladislaus Telesi.

This was written before Count Teleki had seen Cassimer Batthyanyi's recent letter.

This was written before Count Teleki had seen Cassimer Batthyanyi's recent letter.

Letter from Bartholomew Szemere, late Minister of the Interior of the Kingdom of Hungary, to Prince Esterhazy.

I have read your letter, dated Vienna, November 13, and printed in the Times, of December 1, with the greatest attention, but also with the greatest astonishment. It might be supposed, at first, that you intended to give a conscientious account of the course of events in Hungary; but the want of historical truth, of an intimate knowledge of facts, of dates as to time and place, and of everything else that an impartial reader might expect to find in such a document, entirely precludes this supposition. If you had merely exposed the polity of Kossuth, I should have remained silent, for I also regard this policy—though from a different point of view that that which you have taken—as an irrational, temporizing, vacillating policy, such as no one claiming the character of a statesman would, under any circumstances, have pursued. I should also have remained silent if you had only apologiced for your own proceedings, for, although you are well known in European diplomacy, your political influence in your own country is far too trifling to lay claim to criticism. You do not, however, confine yourself within those limits. You accuse the ministry, of which you were a member—accuse the Legislative Assembly, and the nation; you trample on the honorable feelings, on the sense of duty, on the bona fides of all, and then strive on these melancholy ruins to raise a monnment to your own political sagacity. My soul is harrowed to find that you do not even know how to be just towards a country, of which the most ample domains are in your possession. Far be it from me to reproach you for not acquiring, if not in Hungary, at least in England, where pariotism has its cherished home, that primary duty of a citizen—fidelity to the legal constitution of his country—a duty which should have taught you to oppose the power of royalty itself when

entembed.
I am willing to admit that parties in Hungary am willing to admit that parties in riungery may have committed political faults, but only ignorance or a corrupt mind could deby that the sanctity of the laws and the guarantees afforded by the constitution were first infringed by the dynasty. You, Prince Esterhazy, as late Hungarian Minister, maintain the contrary; and this is the question at issue between us. Who shall be the arbitrators? Count Louis Batthyapyi rests in his grave; Count Stephen Night Scapheni, that quissant games is the in-Count Louis Batthyanyi rests in his grave; Count Stephen Széchéoyi, that puissant genus, is the immate of a lunatic asylum. They cannot speak. Three members of the same Ministry are suffering in exile; but three others are now living in Hungary, and I have not the least hesitation to declare that no power on earth could induse them to share your opinious or corroborate your assertions. Yet these three gentlemen belonged to that Ministry that you are pleased to designate as "still honest in its intentions."

You must pardon me if I do not enter into a datalled examination of your assertions. Apologies for your own conduct are so mixed up with the gravest accusations against the nation, and facts relating to different times and places so entangled, that I should most assuredly lose myself were I to follow you through such a labyrinth. Instead of placing your assertions is order and entering the state of the st placing your assertions in order and entering into a refutation of them, I will give a succinct account of the political situation of Hungary. If I should not succeed in making you acquained with the true principles of the Hungarian Jus Publicum, your long diplomatic career, I shall at all events have the satisfaction of placing Hungarian affairs before the readers of the Times, in a point of view from which you had never an opportunity of observing them.

them. he question of the greatest interest for the The question of the greatest interest for the British public is simply this:—Which party first intringed the constitution—the nation or the dynasty? For that party that first intringed it obviously began the revolution. In order that any impartial person may satisfactorily answer this question, I shall merely have to cite some of our Dietal acts, and give a short account of events as they actually counted.

In the year 1526 Ferdinand of Hapsburg was In the year 1526 Ferdinand of Hapsburg was elected King of Hungary by the representatives of the nation in Diet assembled. His successors, from Maximilian to Leopoid I., were elected in the same mainer; but in 1687 an act was passed rendering the crown hereditary in the house of Hapsburg. Anoter Dietal act, passed in 1723, extended the succession to women. By this act, called the Pragmatic Sanction, the rights and independence of Hungary were again solemnly guaranteed by the severiegn. Several other Dietal acts, and numerous royal decrees and rescripts might be cited to show that Hungary was always regarded as an independent kingdom by the severigns of the Hungary decrees the succession of the Hungary was always regarded. that Hungary was always regarded as an independent kingdom by the sovereigns of the House of Hapsburg. The 10th act of the Diet of 1730, sanctioned by Leopold II., will, however, suffuse, as it is therein emphatically made known that, 'Hungary in her entire system of legislation and government is a free and independent kingdom, that is to say, is not sabject to any other kingdom or people, but possessing her own peculiar consistency and constitution, and is, therefore, to be ruled and governed by her legally crowned hereditary Kings according to her national laws and customs.' Other acts, passed at the same Diet, and daly sanctioned by the sovereign, further declare that the power of exacting, altering, and abrogating laws belongs exclusively to the legislature—that is to ray, to the King and the representatives of the nation in the Diet assembled; that this power shall never be exercised in any other way: that Hungary shall never be governed by royal edicts and ordonnances; that the King shall never issue decrees respecting the administration of justice; and that if he should, netwithstanding, issue decrees the courts of pecting the administration of justice; and that if he should, notwithstanding, issue decrees, the courts of justice shell take no notice of them; that a King isto he crowned within six months after his accession to

the throne, and that all denations, rights, privileges &c, granted by an uncrowned King are invalid. Since the year 1622 a king of Hungary, previous Since the year 1022 a king of Hungary, previous to his coronation, is obliged to sign a document called the Inaugural Diploma, which is inserted in the acts of the Diet, and is, in fact, a compact between the nation and the sovereign, by which the latter binds himself to maintain, and caused to be maintained, all the rights, liberties, privileges, immunities, laws, customs, and usages of the kingdom of Hungary, which have been instituted during the reigns of his predecessors, or which may be instituted during his own reign, and finally acknowledges that each of his successors will have to sign a similar inaugural diploma and to take the customary oaths previous to the ceremony of coronation. It is needless for me to add that ferdinand V signed such an inaugural diploma, and took the customary oaths, by which, inter alia, he pledged himself in the most solemn manner not to alionate or dismember any part or portion of the kingdom of Hungary, but to employ all the means at his disposal for the welfare and advantage of the said kingdom.

These are our constitutional guarantees, heades.

dom.
These are our constitutional guarantees; besides These are our consistuational guarantees; besides which we have the treaties of peace concluded between the Hargarian nation and the Hargaburg dynasty. Hurgary, as it is well-known, was traquently obliged, during the rule of this dynasty, to have recourse to arms is defence of her constitutional rights and independence, and the dynasty never rights and independence, and the dynasty never succeeded in re-establishing peace otherwise than by negotiations. And it must be borne in mind that these negotiations of the two beiligerents—the Hungarian nation and the Hapaburg dynasty—were conducted precisely in the name manner as negotiations between two independent States, and frequently through the mediation of foreign cabinets. In this manter were concluded the treatices of Vienna, 1605; of Nikolaburg, 1622; of Preaburg, 1628; of Linz, 1645; and of Szathmar, 1711; cash of which was a fresh guarantee for the constitutional independence of Hungary.

This slight sketch of our political institutions will suffice to show the legal relations that subsisted between Hungary and Austria. In 1848 these re-

lations were intact. Hungary was, both de just and de facto, independent of Austria. Hungary and the Austrian hereditary States had nothing in common except one and the same sovereign. But although Hungary had, generally speaking, maintained its independence, several fundamental articles of its constitution were not observed by the dynasty. The Diets continually insisted on their strict observance, but the dynasty, although they did not venture to call them in question, refused to fulfil them. The task of the Hungarian Diets for this last century has been—first, to maintain the eld constitution; and second, to introduce such reforms as the course of time had rendered necessary. In 1848 the Diet was sitting at Presburg, when the French revolution broke out, but this unexpected event exercised no further influence on it than that of increasing its activity and rendering the sovereign more inclined to accede to the legitimate wishes of the nation. The acts passed by this Diet were strictly legal. Ist In respect to their principle. For the political acts were a simple renovation of the old laws and rights, the observance of which had been neglected by the dynasty, and the other acts related to subjects which the Diets had been accustomed to discuss for half a contury. For the rest the relations between Hungary and Austria remained unchanged. 2d. In respect to their form. For all these acts were drawn up and went through both Houses in the usual manner, and received the royal sanction with the usual formalities. There was no revolutionary movement. malities. There was no revolutionary movement. The people throughout the country hailed with joy the reforms effected by the Diet and sanctioned by

the reforms effected by the Diet and sanctioned by the Sovereign.

That the dynasty may have acceded to the legitimate demands of the nation through fear is possible; but it is, on the other hand, an undeniable fact, that the Diet sid not demand anything that it had not previously sought to obtain, or that was contrary to the principles of the constitution. I defy you to point out any political act passed by this Diet that is at variance with our old laws. Make as many objections as you please, and I will answer each objection by citing the text of a legislative enactment. Paramount in importance was the act binding the King to exercise the executive power by means of a special Hungarian Ministry, and investing the Palatine, in the King's absence, with royal plenipotentiary authority. But this was simply a literal renevation of our old fundamental rights. There was nothing new in the ministerial form of government being essentially rooted in our old constitution.

Laball now proceed to give a succinet account of

I shall now proceed to give a succinet account of what took place from April 14, when the new acts received the royal sanction, to December, 1848. You may be assured that I shall conceal nothing that tended to change the relations between Hungary and Apstrice.

what took place from April 14, when the new a sts received the royal senction, to December, 1818. You may be assured that I shall conceal nothing that tended to change the relations between Hungary and Anstria.

The Prime Minister was already nominated when Jellachich was raired to the dignity of Ban of Croatia by a royal decree which the Premier was not even asked to countersign. The Hungarian Ministers, nevertheless, for the sake of peace, overlocked this irregular proceeding.

By a decree, dated June 10, 1848, the king made known to all whom it might concern, that all the troops stationed within the kingdom of Hungary, whether Hungarians or Austrians, were placed under the orders of the Hungarian Minister of War, and that all the Hungarian fortresses were under the jurisdiction of the said Minister. Yet at this very time officers of the imperial and royal army were taking an axive part in the rebellion of the Serbs and Valachs, while General Mayerhofer was enlisting recruits in the principality of Servia, and sending them to assist the robels. The people thus beheld with astonishment civil war break out, and saw with still greater astonishment that imperial officers were fighting on both sides.

Jellachich, as a functionary of the Hungasian crown, refused to obey the Hungarian Ministry, and illegally summoned a Croatian Diet to meet at Agram on June 5. In consequence of those proceedings Ferdinand V., by a decree dated June 10, 1848, deprived him, as a rebel, of all his civil and military offices and dignities, but at the same time sent him, through his Minister of War, Latour, field officers, artillery, and ammunition.

The troubles increased daily. The Hungarian Ministry requested the Archduke John to act as mediator. He accepted the office, but did nothing.

The Diet met on July 2. The Palatine, as the representative of the sovereign, in the speech from the throne, said that, as several districts were in a state of open rebellion, the principal objects to which, in the name of his Majesty, he should direc of these agitators have even proceeded so far in their iniquitous course as to spread the report that this armed opposition has been made in the interests of the dynasty, and with the knowledge and consivence of his Majesty or of the members of his Majesty or of the members of his Majesty or of the members of his Majesty's royal house. I therefore, in order that all the inhabitants of the kingdom, without distinction as te creed or language, may have their minds set at rest, hereby declare, in conformity with the sovereign behest of his Majesty our most gracious King, and in his sovereignname and person, that it is his Majesty's firm and steadfast determination to defend with all his royal power and authority the unity and integrity of his royal. Hungarian crown against every attack from without, and every attempt at disruption and separation that may be made within the kingdom, and at the same time inviolably to maintain the laws which have received the royal sanction. And while his Mejesty will not soffer any one to curtail the liberties assured to all classes by the law, his Majesty, strongly condemns the audacity of those who venture to affirm that any illegal act whatsoever or any disrespect of the constituted authorities can be reconcilable with his Majesty's sovereign will, or at all compatible with the interests of the royal dynasty.

It thus clearly appears that the King acknowledged the validity and the inviolability of the acts passed by the Diet of 1847-8, three months after they had been sanctioned.

Relying on the sincerity of the Royal asseverations, the Diet humbly requested that His Majesty would be meet graciously pleased to render the country happy by his presence. It was, in fact, the general wish that the King should come to Hungary; even the most radical journals loudly declared that if he came, he would be received with enthusiasm bordering on madness.

Meanwhile the rebellion of the Croate, Serbs and other field efficers of the Imperial army, were at the head of it, without any one of th

valachs was spreading daily, and that, too, in the rame of the Sovereign. Generals, colonels, and other field efficers of the Imperial army, were at the head of it, without any one of them being summored by the King to answer for his conduct. The eyes of the too credulous natives were now opened, and still more when the King refused- to sanctism the sets for the levying of troops and raising of funds for the suppression of the rebellion, although the Diet had been convened chiefly for this parpose.

I must here observe that at this period nothing whatever had occurred that could serve as a pretext whatever had occurred that could serve as a pretext for the dynasty to support the robellion. The Diet, it is true, would not consent that the troops that were to be levied should be draughted into the old regiments; but it was obviously impossible for the Diet to consent to any such measures at a peried when the robes were everywhere led by Imperial officers, when the Austrian troops stationed in Hungary, although they had been placed under the orders of the Hungarian Ministry, refused to fight against those rebels, and the commanders of fortresses to receive orders from the Hungarian war office.

or effice.
On the 8th of September a deputation from the On the 8th of September a deputation from the Hunganian Diet earnestly entreated his majesty to sarction two acts relating to the levying of troops and taxes. The king refused; but in his answer to the address of the deputation said, "I trust that no one will hereby suppose that I have the intention to set aside or intringe the existing laws. This, I repeat, is far from my intention. On the contrary, it is my firm and determined will to maintain, in conformity with my corenation oath, the laws, the integrity, and the rights of the kingdom, under my Hungarian crown."

ungarian crown."
The king made this solemn declaration on the The king made this solemn declaration on the 5th of September, and on the 5th of September Jelachich crossed the Drave with 48 000 men, to wage war in the king's name on the Hungarian Diet and ministry. The king had, moreover, on the 4th of September, affixed his sign manual to a letter, or royal mandate, addressed to Jellachich, and revoking the decree by which he had been deprived of his civil and military offices and dignities. His majesty, in this letter, also expresses his high approbation of the Ban's conduct. By a royal decree, dated October 3, the constitution was suspended, martial law proclaimed, and Jellachich, the rebel, appointed his majesty's Plenipotentiary Commissary for the kingdom of Hungary, and invested with unlimited authority to act, in the name of his majesty, within

thority to act, in the name of his majesty, within the said kingdom.

Hungary, so far from commencing the revolution, was not even prepared to meet the invasion of the Creatian Ban. He was defeated near Stuhlweissenburg by the Landsturm. The Hungarian government only began to organize regular troops in October.

That the Diet did not recognize a decree that suspended the constitution and invested Jollachich with the dictatorsaip will be found quite natural, if net by you, at least by every Englishman who chorishes constitutional freedom, the more so as its proceedings on this secasion were founded on legal right, viz., on act 4, sect 6, of the Diet of 1817 s, which expressly ordains that "the annual session of the Diet shall not be closed, nor the Diet itself dissolved, before the budget for the ensuing year has been voted."

From this short but faithful account of what actually occurred, it elearly appears that the Hungarian nation had not recourse to arms until the Ban of Cretic entered the Hungarian territory with an Austro-Croatian army. It is also an undeniable fact, that until the promulgation of the Austrian charter in March, 1819, by which, with a stroke of the pen, the independence of Hungary was destroyed, its constitution sholished, an its environment of smanded anything else than the maintenance of the laws and institutions which its sovereign had sancisced and sworn to maintain involate. It was, however, precisely for the purpose of destroying these laws and institutions that the dynasty bogan the war. This, of course, they did not veature to avow. It was necessary to conceal the real motives of their perfidious conduct from the civilized world. Hence in their public proclamations they always alleged some pretext or other—all of them equally groundless. At the commencement, they said that it was only an insignificant faction they had to deal with, but when they saw that the whole nation was arrayed in arms against them, they delared it was for the suppression of demagnagusism, propagated by foreigners, chiefly Poles, that their armies had entered Hungary and to give color to this pretext they industriously spread the report that there were 20,000 Poles in the ranks of the Hungarians. When, however, it became notorious that now on the standard, the Austrian dynasty appeared as the soi disanct champion and j

fore September there was no one in Hungary who would have been able to get up an agitation against the King. At the end of September, the sentiments of loyalty that had so long animated the nation were replaced by an intense feeling of diagust. With the mimbus of Majesty every other prestige had fit d. The old Hungarian people had ceased to exist. It might be supposed, in fact, to judge from their actions, that Kings waited impatiently for the maturity of the people, in order that all who are not republicans by principle should be forced to embrace republicanism through the hatted and aversion which such actions must necessarily inspire.

tred and aversion which such actions must neces-sarily inspire.

I must omit noticing several of your assertions, groundless though they be, because it is not my intention either to defend or to consure the conduct of any one. I shall also refrain from expressing any opinios on the question, whether, although honorable and loyal it was also pradent and poli-tic for the nation to cling so long to legitimacy. Facts, however, cannot be denied. The nation fell a sacrifice to its own policy. The heroism of re-maining so long in the path of constitutional le-gality redounds to its glery; the shortsigh edness of entering so late on the path of revolution is its shame. But "heroism," to use the words of an shame. But "heroism," to use the words of an American writer, "is a self-trust which slights the restraints of prudence in the plenitude of its onergy and power to repair the harms it may suffer." That the harms which Hungary now suffers will one day be repaired is the trust and firm conviction of every Huzgarian who is proudly conscious of having performed the duty which he owed to his country. How far you may share this conviction I will not pretend to decide, but have the honor to be, with the usual courtesies, your very obedient,

BARTHOLOMEW SZEMERS,
Late Minister of the Interior of the Kingdom of Paris, Dec. 9.

Late Minister of the Interior of the Kingdom of Paris, Dec. 9.

Letter of S. Vukovics, late Minister of Justice of Hungary.

Letter from Count Casimir Batthyanyi, which met, I do not doubt, with the unanimous approbation of our countrymen in that part of it which vindicates the first Hungarian ministry, and more particularly that immortal patriot Count Louis Batthyanyi, against the unpatriotic and groundless aspersions of Prince Esterhary. The noble count, however, in the latter part of his letter, turns suidonly to another subject, and undertakes to discuss some principles and events of our revolution in a manner which has placed him in direct antagonism to the advocates of the cause of Hungary. I must confess that it is with great regret that I feel myself compelled to combat the assertions of a man who, by his patriotism, his intelligence, and his great zacrifices on the altar of his native country, has taken so distinguished a place in our ranks.

It is true that after the close of the Diet of IS47-43, and after the royal sanction given to the reforms carried by it, the whole country, with scarcely the exception of a small fastion, was sincerely attached to the maintenance of the union with the House of Austria. This circumstance is of parameunt importance, because Hungary, with its constitutional and independent ministries of war and finance, was then thoroughly in a condition in a short time to have created a power sufficient to cope with, and even to overture, the house of Austria, shackled, as it then was, by the critical state of Vienns and Italy. The nation, owever, held to the unhappy defusion that the ately sworn oath of the King was taken in good faith. The more, therefore, I agree with the noble cent, as to the prevailing sentiment and opinion of the country at the close of the Diet on the I lith of April, IS48, the more decidedly must I combat his assertions, that the nation, after so many clandestine and open attacks of the cent on the ansient constitution, and even after the imposition of the J

guess proceedings, would not permit himself to be carried away into a flagrant breach of the constitution. This was the time when the King, in the opinion of the people, was kept distinct from the Camarilla. But when the Austrian ministry openly attempted to deprive Hungary of its ministries of war and finance, when the base game of the degradation and restoration of Jellachich was played, and when the Hungarian army, fighting in the name of the King against the insurrections of the Serbians and Croats, became aware that the balls of that same King thinned their ranks from the hostile camp, the nation arrived at the universal conviction that the Hapsburg dynasty were only pursuing their old absolute texteendes, and that they wanted to force Hungary into self defence, in order, under the pretext of rebellion, to deprive it of all its constitutional rights and guarantees. It needs no proof that a loud indignation and even hatged of the dynasty spread far and wide in the country in consequence of these intrigues and proceedings. In spite of this natural excitement, and of the war itself carried on by the nation with an increasing onthusiasm of hatred of the House of Austria,